

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JOHN KNECHT, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE  
INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-1575RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. # 96) for reconsideration of two aspects of the court's August 14 order.

A motion for reconsideration must demonstrate either "manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority [that] could not have been brought to [the court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1).

Except as to one issue that is not material to the outcome of the August 14 order, Plaintiff's motion meets neither standard, and the court accordingly DENIES it.

The court stated that Plaintiff had not established that he would benefit from showing a "split" of the note evidencing his loan and the deed of trust securing that loan. Aug. 14 ord. (Dkt. # 93) at 17. Plaintiff correctly points out that if he were to do so, he could prevent the nonjudicial foreclosure of his home.

1 The court does not, however, reconsider its ruling that Plaintiff offered neither  
2 evidence nor argument sufficient to create a triable issue over whether his note and deed  
3 of trust were actually split.

4 Finally, Plaintiff misunderstands the court's rejection of his argument that his note  
5 was not negotiable. The court did not state that he had offered no evidence or argument  
6 on that issue, it stated that he had offered "no evidence, precedent, or argument *that*  
7 *necessitates further discussion of that issue.*" Aug. 14 ord. at 17 (emphasis added). The  
8 court reiterates that statement.

9 Dated this 3rd day of September, 2014.

10   
11

12 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
13 United States District Court Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27